DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 559 FL 005 457

AUTHOR Spolsky, Bernard
TITLE The Development of Navajo Bilingual Education.
PUB DATE Jun 73
NOTE 36p.; Prepared for the Symposium on Sociolinguistics and Language Planning (June 27-29, 1973) of the AAAS/CONACYT meeting on Science and Man in the Americas

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *American Indian Languages; *Bilingual Education; Diglossia; *Educational Policy; *Language Planning; Language Standardization; *Navaho; Nonstandard Dialects; Official Languages; Sociolinguistics; Standard Spoken Usage

ABSTRACT

Bilingual education in the United States has been directed by various language education policies to which there are three dimensions: (1) the language or dialect the child speaks on entering school; (2) the type of language policy in the school, which may be monolingual or one of three types of bilingual policies; (3) the divisions of language functions which reflects the appropriateness of each language or dialect for the spoken and written channels and various social situations. To propose a language education policy, particularly in the design of bilingual education programs for nonstandardized languages, three types of languages or dialects must be considered: world, standard, and local, all of which interact in advancing the community to a modern life. On this basis, the problems of bilingual education for the Navajo have involved the development of an orthography; standardization, so that the written language may be taught; and modernization, to facilitate the handling of modern concepts. The last five years have been marked by a growing acceptance of the potential value of Navajo bilingual education, which is recognized as more than an answer to a language problem; rather, it is a central element in changing education from an alien function to one shared or controlled by the community. (LG)

ED 094559

The Development of Navajo Bilingual Education

Bernard Spolsky

The University of New Mexico

Prepared for the Symposium on Sociolinguistics and Language Planning, June 27-29, 1973, sponsored by the Linguistic Society of America in collaboration with the Programa Interamericano de Linguistica y Ensenanza de Idiomas, as part of the AAAS/CONACYT meeting on "Science and Man in the Americas.

FL005 457

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Bernard Spolsky
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

When in the late 1960's America rediscovered bilingual education, educators felt for a while as though they were explorers in a virgin field.[1] For the first time, they thought, school systems were about to deal with the problems of teaching in more than one language, and to face up to the difficulty of teaching children whose language was not that of the school. In the first flurry of excitement, they rushed to set up new models, to discover new approaches, and generally to feel all the uncertainties and joys of innovation. But very quickly, a few scholars pointed out that bilingual education is new neither in time nor in place;[2] historians of American education pointed out that for much of America, bilingual education had been the norm until the xenophobic outbursts about the time of the first world war;[3] and sociologists of language made clear that in much of the world today, teaching in more than one language or teaching children whose language is different from that of the school is very common.[4] These studies provide us with the perspective to understand our own problems more clearly; at the same time, those working in bilingual educaiton in America can now feel themselves not isolated but part of a serious world-wide movement, long established and vital to education, concerned with establishing appropriate language education policies for multilingual communities.

There are several ways of classifying bilingual education programs. One of the most useful, if somewhat complex,

is the typology developed by Professor William Mackey who attempted to fit into one model all the various kinds of situations in which bilingual programs might be called for, and the various educational strategies that might be followed to meet those situations.(5) Another, more simple, by Professor Joshua Fishman proposes three major types of bilingual program.(6) Drawing on both of these, I would suggest that it is possible to describe language education policy (including the bilingual program) along three dimensions, one concerned with the child's language situation, one with the language education policy, and one with the division of language functions.

The first dimension concerns the child: any language education policy must take into account the language situation of the child when he comes to school. There are four main factors to be considered. First, how well is he able to communicate with his teacher, and with his schoolmates? The classic situation of language as a barrier to education arises where the child does not speak the same language as his teacher.(7) The second factor concerns the attitude of the school to the language spoken by the child. Do his teachers, the school officially, and his schoolmates encourage him in the language he speaks, simply accept his variety or reject it. Each of these leads to different possiblities of education. The third factor, to which I will be returning in much more detail later, is the nature of the language that the child speaks and the language that the school itself has chosen as language of instruction as goal. What sort of language is involved? A

world language? A standardized language? A localized variety? The final factor in this first dimension is the degree of homogeneity. Are we dealing with a situation where all children have the same language background? Is it a situation like the Navajo Reservation where things are relatively simple, where we know we are dealing simply with English and Navajo? Or is it on the other hand a situation like Uganda, where 28 languages compete for attention in the policy of the school?(8) The first dimension, then, is concern with the child and the language choice.

The second dimension in which I follow Fishman's analysis with minor exceptions, concerns the kind of language policy. The simplest kind of policy is possible when all pupils come to school speaking the same standard variety of a world language. In these conditions, one might choose the purest kind of monolingual education. Here, language education is concerned with the enrichment of the pupil's control of his mother tongue, the development of reading and writing in it, and optionally the addition of some other languages (usually classical or other standard languages) for special purposes. This kind of policy, which I will label Type M (monolingual and middleclass) was for a long time incorrectly assumed by American educators to be the norm. Such an assumption was possible only as long as educators were able to ignore the fact that in most parts of the world and in much of America children come to school speaking a language or variety that is not the same as that aimed at by the school. In the

very many cases where a Type M policy is impossible there are various possibilities of bilingual or bidialectal or multilingual or multidialectal education. Fishman proposes three main classes.

Type A policy occurs when the school chooses to use as its medium of instruction a world language or a language of wider communication that is not the mother tongue of any of its pupils. It also occurs when a school aims to use a single dialectal variety when in fact its pupils speak many other dialects. Type A policy, in other words, is what happens when one tries to apply a Type M policy in an inappropriate situation. The consequences of this decision are serious. First, if there is to be any kind of education, there has to be some minimal transition program in the pupils' variety to establish communication between teacher and students. Where this is not the case, and in fact in American Indian education it has seldom been the case, there is a serious barrier between the teacher and pupils that develops a permanent block to education. Type A policies have even more serious consequences, for as well as building a barrier between pupil and teacher, they effectively isolate the school from its community. Very often, such a policy involves the school insisting on a standard language or dialect for all its uses and the result is described by Fishman in this way:

> It artificializes education in that it identifies it with a variety that is not functional in the life

> of the community. It threatens the viability of the students' primary community and of its primary networks in that it implies that only by leaving his native speech repertoire behind can the student enter upon a new role repertoire (and by a new reward schedule). It causes education to depend on outsiders to the community--a veritable army of occupation and pacification on occasion--rather than permitting it to be a partially shared function across communities or a community controlled function.[9] (Fishman 1971:361)

This kind of model, and its results, may be illustrated well by the general situation of Navajo education until quite recently. Fishman might indeed have been writing about the Navajo situation when he pointed out that the result of an attempt at monolingual standard language education in an inappropriate situation like this is an army of occupation. The figures are not precise but the overall picture is clear. In the 1971-72 school year, there were over 50,000 Navajo children between the ages of 5 and 18 enrolled in BIA, public, or other schools. Most of the pupils speak Navajo (98% of those entering BIA schools, close to 90% of those entering public schools); few of them know much English (12% of those entering BIA schools, less than half of those coming to public schools).[10] In the same year, these children had over 2,200 teachers, all of whom knew English but probably fewer

than 100 of whom knew Navajo. In this situation, how can teachers be other than an "army of occupation", as they sit locked away in school compounds, unable to communicate with their pupils or with the parents of their pupils? This, then, is type A bilingual education: bilingual in that the children are forced to work with two languages, but monolingual in that the school refuses to recognize it.

Type B policies, as Professor Fishman classifies them, are much more permissive. While in a type B policy there is emphasis of one language as the basic language of wider communication, the national language, and the language to be used for major purposes, in this kind of policy other languages are recognized for local or for other more limited uses. In the same way, type B policies apply in multi-dialectal situations: while they assume that one variety, the standard dialect, should be used for some school subjects from the beginning and for all subjects in the highest grades, they recognize that other language varieties have a place throughout primary school at least probably into high school and certainly in outside society. How such a policy works is described in some detail by Fishman and Luders[11] (1972) in their analysis of the situation in the area of Germany around Stuttgaart. This area called Schwaben is one in which most people speak a dialect of German called Swabian. There are at least five varieties of the Swabian dialect ranging from one which might be labeled peasant

language to a highest variety which is quite close to standard High German. Very few Swabians can speak a form of German that completely disguises their dialect background; a much larger group (businessmen, educators, administrators, etc.) speak easily the highest variety of Swabian, but, when among friends or at home speak a less formal variety of the local dialect. This is the most formal variety for less educated speakers. In Schwaben, it is certainly considered desirable to learn and speak High German, but it is completely acceptable to continue to speak a regional variety. In the schools, children are presented with High German from the beginning; they are taught to read in High German for none of the German primers is in dialect; they learn many proverbs and songs and poems in High German but are never expected to use it in spontaneous speech. The teachers themselves seem, in use, to vary between level 4, the more formal, and level 5, the most formal of the local dialects, but generally accept their students' spontaneous speech in one of the less formal dialects. Basically, then, what happens is that while the National standard form is considered desirable and is presented in school, the local regional varieties are considered acceptable for many purposes within school just as they are in the outside society. In type B policies, then, school accepts its task as teaching a standard language or variety but does not consider it necessary for it to suppress the indigeneous language or dialect.

In the American situation, we might note that bilingual education varies between a kind of improved type A (where the emphasis is on quick transition from the local language to English) to a form of type B where it is accepted that the second language, the language of the children and their community, might continue to be used in both school and the outside world.

The third kind of bilingual education policy that Fishman describes is the one that arises in a country where there are several competing languages, each associated with a major tradition (a religion, a history, a culture) and each with many powerful supporters. In such a type C policy, which might be illustrated by the situations in Norway or in Belgium, all pupils are educated in their own language or dialect. They are also educated in another variety which they can use as a link with fellow citizens who speak a different language from theirs. The language used for link purposes may be one of the competing languages or may be an outside language chosen because it does not suggest favoritism to one group. These kinds of policy provide the second dimension that needs to be described in describing language education policy.

In describing the third dimension, we consider the way in which a language education policy reflects the appropriateness of each variety for the various channels or media and style or domains. For each variety, for example, emphasis may be on receptive or productive competence and on the spoken

or written channel. In the Swabian example, we noted that while the local varieties were acceptable for productive competence in the spoken channel, the student was expected to develop receptive competence in the standard language; for the written channel on the other hand, he was expected to develop both receptive and productive competence in the standard language.

This question of the division of the channels is extremely important and becomes very clear when one notes the present situation on the Navajo Reservation. Here, with a number of important minor but interesting exceptions that I will discuss later, there is a virtual diglossia between writing and speech. Virtually all written activities on the Reservation are conducted in English. On the other hand, most spoken functions are or may be conducted in Navajo. Meetings of the Tribal Council take place mainly in Navajo, but all records and legislation are written in English. Chapter meetings use only Navajo, but minutes are kept in English. Tribal court sessions are usually held in Navajo, but their records are written in English. The communication media show a similar distinction. Most radio stations on the periphery of the Reservation broadcast an hour or more a day in Navajo. The broadcasts consist of country and western music (in English) with news, announcements and advertisements in Navajo. The Navajo language announcers, however, work from English scripts, translating as they go

along. The official Tribal newspaper on the other hand, is entirely in English, and even the more recently established unofficial papers use English almost exclusively, This distinction showed up also at a recent Navajo bilingual education conference. Most of the important speeches were given in Navajo or in Navajo first, but in almost all cases the speaker was working from a draft that he had typed in front of him in English. A second classification along this dimension could be made in terms of style as was mentioned in the case of Swabian or in terms of domains. A domain in this sense is a general grouping of factors such as setting, topic, and participant definable in terms of some social situation. For example, one may ask about languages for the home, the neighborhood, school, work, religion, culture, government, and travel; and for each of these one may find differences in actual use or in aim. As long as a language is alive and vital, it is being used in the home: when we ask about the situation of American Indian languages today, the key factor suggesting the chance of maintenance is whether the language is still used in the home and whether the children are learning to speak it. A dying language is one where all the speakers are adults and no children still speak it.(12)

With the help of this model for the description of language education policy, it is possible to look more carefully at the special problems of non-standardized languages.

Before I do this, however, I would like to take a few minutes to look at one other major dimension that is relevant to the whole situation with bilingual education programs. While of course any dichotomy is over-simplification, there seems to be a generalized distinction possible between bilingual education programs whose major aim is making it possible for children to be educated who would otherwise be barred by the language of school and those programs where the aim is rather language revival or ethnic maintenance. The distinction resides in the first of the dimensions that I described earlier, the language situation of children. There are many cases, as we all know, where children come to school speaking a language different from that chosen by the school as its standard language. For these children, bilingual education is an absolute necessity; without it, there is a language barrier to their education. At the other end of the continuum, there are cases where an ethnic or linguistic group wishes to maintain or revive their language through the institution of school when in fact they have given up on its maintenance within the home. In these cases, bilingual education is more of an ethnic or political requirement than a strictly educational one. Without going into any kind of value judgment, it is clear that the first kind which might be called child salvage is more vital and urgent than the second which might be called language salvage.

In setting up any language education policy, just as in establishing any other education system, two of the major necessities are, of course, qualified teachers and a suitable curriculum. A bilingual education policy obviously requires teachers to control both the varieties that it is intended to teach, and materials and curriculum available for each variety. It is at this point that we come across the special problem of what I will call the pre-standardized languages. If you will recall, when talking about the dimensions for describing a language education policy, I made a brief reference to the nature of the varieties themselves. Let me expand this slightly. What sort of language or dialect is involved will make a considerable difference to the possibilities of language education policy. The major types that are relevant are three: 1) A world language, that is, a language used over wide areas of the world, that provides access to modern culture, science, technology, and economic life. 2) A standard language, accepted for full use within the political unit involved, and permitting expression of the widest range of cultural, scientific, technological and economic notions. 3) A local vernacular, a social or regional dialect, unstandardized and lacking vocabulary to handle significant areas of technology, science, culture, and economic life.

While the whole range of possibilities is clearly a continuum, with a possible approximation to what some people suggest has been an evolution towards potential for autonomous speech, there are two related but separate dimensions: the provision of access to advanced science and technology, and the provision of access to literacy and modern life. Access to advanced science and technology is required for at least an elite within any modern state, the group who are to receive tertiary education. While access to literacy and general terms of modern life is, of course, desirable for all who will complete the primary level and certainly for those who will go to secondary or high school education. A language education policy is constrained by this fact. When one chooses a pre-standardized language for national or school use it becomes necessary to modernize and standardize it and so, of course, raise it to the second type. There are similar problems in choosing a language of the second type for national use, for it is necessary to teach a world language to those who will go on to higher education. This second situation may be illustrated in any of the countries that use a national language, but not a world language for education. They face the difficult and frustrating task of teaching a large significant elite control of a world language. All other factors aside, there is a

tension established in popular education in a technological society between the situation of children many of whom come to school speaking a local variety and the needs of a modern society for as many speakers as possible of a world language; for nationalistic or political of cultural reasons, there are often good reasons for maintaining a local standard language.(13) This tension is at the heart of the difficulty of establishing a satisfactory language education policy in many cases. I should like to illustrate this in much more detail by looking at the problems faced in developing bilingual education for the Navajo and the problems involved in three major areas: developing a written language, developing a standardized language, and developing a modern language.

The earliest attempts at writing Navajo were the work of English speaking anthropologists, linguists and missionaries who developed in the 19th and early 20th century a number of orthographies for various scholarly, academic, and religious purposes.(14) By mid 1930's, there were several competing alphabetic systems, each with its own supporters and proponents. In the mid 1930's the Bureau of Indian Affairs, following a shift in policy from the older "de-Indianization" to a new interest in local Indian affairs, took the first step towards developing a standard orthography for Navajo. Working together, John P. Harrington

(a linguist with little experience in Athapaskan languages) Robert Young, and William Morgan developed an orthography that seemed to suit the general needs of Navajo education and produced a few primers none of which were published. However, in the early 40's, a new effort was made and a literacy team, prominent members of whom were Robert Young and William Morgan, worked on developing reading materials most of which were published bilingually. During this time, Young and Morgan published The Navaho Language which has since then been the standard grammar and dictionary, worked on a number of other readers, and began publishing a monthly Navajo language newspaper. At the same time, the translation of the Bible into Navajo was undertaken by the Wycliffe Bible Translators. In a most important decision, rather than choosing one of the other alphabets that had been developed by missionaries, or setting out to develop their own, the Wycliffe translators decided to use the "government" orthography. From the mid 1940's until the mid 50's, there were various attempts at literacy campaigns, usually with comparatively little success, and in all the Young and Morgan orthography continued to be used. However, in 1957, with the new emphasis on teaching and learning of English, the publication of the newspaper stopped and the Bureau of Indian Affairs turned its attention away from written Navajo. The interest in Navajo

as a school language was revived, however, in the mid 60's with the present wave of interest in bilingual education. One of the first questions faced up to was that of an orthography. On the initiative of the Center for Applied Linguistics, a conference was called in 1969 to discuss Navajo orthography. The conference attempted to face up to the basic problems of choosing an acceptable orthography. It adopted four major principles in arriving at its decision. It recognized that for some time there should be considerable flexibility in personal writing, while at the same time there would need to be general uniformity of published texts. 2) It agreed that the orthography should be aimed to meet only the needs of native speakers of Navajo, and not, as so often the case, the problems of speakers of other languages wanting to learn Navajo. 3) The conference considered that some attention needed to be paid to the problem of transfer when readers of Navajo began to read English but felt that this should not be a major factor. 4) Finally, the conference agreed that there needed to be some sort of balance between phonemic and morphophonemic considerations:

> In general it was agreed that the orthography should reflect the phonemic structure of Navajo on the basis of one simple or complex symbol for each unit. It was realized that in questions of

> spelling there would be problems, especially on morphophonemic matters. It was suggested that where possible a uniform spelling be maintained where pronunciation changes occurred as a result of morphophonemic process. It was suggested that as the orthography was used, a careful record be kept of the problem areas and that psycholinguistic tests be made to determine whether changes to a more phonetic spelling made reading easier or not

The orthography accepted by the conference was basically the Young and Morgan alphabet with slight modifications made by the Wycliffe Translators and other scholars. Some suggestions for more substantial alphabet changes were rejected.

In a very thorough study of Navajo orthography, its history and its principles, Wayne Holm has analyzed the basis for this decision and the general suitability of the present orthographic system.(16) His conclusions are interesting: he finds it quite reasonable to believe that the present system could in fact be considerably simplified; that it would be possible, for example, to write Navajo just as well without using some of the diacritics presently used for length, tone, and nasality. He has shown in a number of small experiments that this is the case. But, his conclusions are concerned not with this

possibility but with the method with which the decisions will be made. The decision, he points out, will be made by the people themselves and will depend on their interest in developing a literature of their own. The present system, with its diacritics, appears to make it much harder to learn to write (and not much easier to learn to read), but decisions in matters like this are made not by scholars sitting in studies or attending conference they are made by the people using the language themselves.

The same is ultimately true when one comes to speak of the problems of standardization. All the time that a language is not written, there is little need to worry about differences in pronunciation among different members of a language group. There is little need to worry that different people have different names for the same thing. With a little sympathy, we can usually make allowances for the regional terms used by others. But once one starts writing school textbooks and dictionaries and grammars, there needs to be some degree of agreement, some standardization. The dictionary written by Young and Morgan and the subsequent additions provide that standardization in an important way for Navajo. But many problems remain to be solved. In the very first reading book that we produced, we chose to follow the dictionary in spelling the word for cat Mosi; but in our second book, the writer was insistent that in her dialect the word must clearly be spelled Masi.

Issues like this will continue to face all concerned with the development of Navajo literacy and decisions will continue to be made by the writers and publishers with as much help as is possible from the writers of dictionaries. We are only just starting to understand the complexity of Navajo dialects which appear to vary not just regionally but, when one looks at certain complex parts of the morphology, to vary almost individually. One can assume that as school continues to move into the area of teaching Navajo and teaching in Navajo there will continue to be more standardization.

The third problem is that of modernization. As a language is moved from its traditional functions to handling the requirements of modern technology, it runs into tremendous gaps. Some people have held that languages are incapable of handling concepts that are new; this is obviously wrong. At the same time, it is true that languages develop in order to handle the concepts with which they are most concerned. While every language has the potential for expressing every idea, it often lacks an efficient way of doing it. As new ideas are introduced then the speakers of the language need to develop new and more efficient ways of expressing these new ideas. The process is already well underway in the case of Navajo. In earlier years, most students of Navajo followed a view developed

first by Sapir[17] that certain languages (of which Navajo was a leading example) were unprepared to borrow from other languages but rather would always find it easier to create new words by compounding. They believed that this was a result of a psychological attitude. If this was so, the whole problem of modernization would involve creating new words within the language to handle all the new ideas. The dictionary and other studies in the 1940's and 50's list fewer than 40 words in Navajo borrowed from Spanish, and this the result of more than three centuries of contact. Even fewer loan words were listed from English. Rather than borrowing, Navajo appeared to use descriptive terms. Young and Morgan cite as an example the word for tank which may be translated literally "the automobile that crawls about upon which they set big things by means of which explosions take place". Writing in 1941 Haile points out how few loan words there were in Navajo, "Pueblo contact has not influenced Navajo to a noticeable degree while Spanish elements in the language are comparatively few and English elements practically none".[18]

But, in the last 30 years there has been a serious change. This change involves clearly social factors for the language is still basically as before, just as capable of elaborate coining of new words from native elements. The amount of contact with English has, of course, increased tremendously. A large number of young Navajo men served in the armed forces during World War II. An even larger number left the Reservation to work in war related industry. Since then, contact with the outside world has continued to increase. As late as 1949, fewer than half of school age Navajo children were in school, but by 1955, attendance were close to 90%. As a result, while both absolutely and proportionately the Navajo are the largest group of non-English speaking Indians in the United States, and while over two-thirds of six year olds still come to school unable to do first grade work in English, the language situation on the Reservation has changed markedly in the last 30 years. These sociolinguistic changes have evidently led to an increased receptivity to loan words.

In the course of a study of the speech of six year old Navajo children we analyzed taped interviews of over 200 children, preparing among other things a spoken word count.(19) In looking over the data, we noticed early the

occurrence of English words in otherwise Navajo conversations. In the first interview, a child who was asked in Navajo "How old are you?", replied "five" in English but continued to speak in Navajo. To investigate the extent and nature of this phenomenon we went through the complete text of all the interviews and listed all English words. A computer program prepared a concordance of these words printing them in alphabetical order and giving the sentence context in which they occurred. We omitted from consideration in our study personal names: the widespread use of English first names and surnames among the Navajo is a topic in itself. Within the corpus we found 508 different words that we classified as loan words representing 9% of the different words children used in the corpus. Loan words occurred 1,549 times, 3.6% of the 33,580 words used by the children in all. These two figures show the great change since the 1940 position when there were practically no English words in Navajo. Most of the words, as one would expect, are nouns. Many are used with Navajo suffixes. In meaning, the loan words cover a wide range of domains or centers of interest. In general, as might be anticipated, the words refer to non-Navajo objects or concepts reflecting the culture from which they are borrowed. Objects and concepts associated with the domain of schools--school equipment and supplies, numbers, time, events, school book animals-- are prominent. A second

major grouping are non-Navajo foods. More surprising perhaps are the kinship terms and some of the animal names. But it is reasonable to generalize that the terms generally represent new or alien concepts or objects and give evidence of acculturation.

It is clear then that by now Navajo is ready to modernize. It has available three major resources for handling the concepts associated with school. First, there are the great resources of vocabulary that are part of the traditional culture. In a number of magnificent studies, Werner has shown the richness of Navajo vocabulary in such areas as names of parts of the body, classification of world system, and classification of animal and plant life. There is a highly developed native science, and within it are terms and expressions for handling great parts of the scientific and social science curriculum. The second resource is its possibilities for coinage of new terms. With the complexity of the verb, Navajo has a rich and endless possibility of coinage: once one can agree on the meaning of a stem, there are a great number of possibilities or ways in which it can be used. This kind of richness has recently been demonstrated by the young Navajo linguist Paul Platero.(21) And thirdly, there is the possibility of borrowing, for it is clear that the language and the speakers of it are now prepared

to take English words and use them in the midst of Navajo. Teachers who for the first time are attempting first grade arithmetic have little difficulty in handling the lack of terms: they borrow words from English or they find ways of saying it in Navajo. The problem that will need to be faced up to is that these decisions are often being made on an ad hoc basis, within one school without communication with others. Thus, modernization itself will need to be correlated soon with some degree of standardization.

But when one looks at the wider prospectus, it is clear that these problems are not new. Anybody who traces the development of education in Hebrew in Israel over the last 50 years or of education in Indonesia over the last 30 years, will find similar difficulties. While Hebrew has a long tradition of writing and standardization of written language, it had no spoken standard and it lacked many of the terms needed for much of modern life. But within 50 years it was revived as a normal spoken language with standard pronunciation and spelling,and with coined or created terms to handle all the possibilities of modern life. Similarly, when Indonesian became the standard language for the school system, ways were found to develop all the terms needed to make this possible. The processes themselves are complex, and only just starting to be

understood. But the speakers of American Indian languages who wish to develop their languages for use in school can know that what they are doing has been done and is being done. The final decision on developing bilingual education need not be handicapped because the language is not standardized and not modernized.

In spite of the theoretical and practical difficulties that have been sketched so far, the last five years have been marked by a growing acceptance of the potential value of Navajo bilingual education, and by a number of specific programs. The reason for this is not hard to find: underlying the movement has been an understanding of the causes of the frustration of so many other efforts to improve Navajo education. It has come to be recognized that the striking disparity between the pupils, over 90% of whom speak Navajo, and the teacher, fewer than 5% of whom know their pupils' language, is a basic cause of failure. The chance that an English-speaking teacher, however well-trained and well-intentioned, can come to communicate effectively with a class of Navajo-speaking pupils is clearly slight. Even with an effective English as a second language program (and the 1970 evaluation of English as a second language programs in Navajo area schools made clear the failure of the programs), there is serious retardation, waste of human resources, and continued alienation of education from the community all the

time that the present single-variety policy continues. Bilingual education has become a pressing need for Navajo schools; without it, Navajo students are doomed to inferior education. The development of Navajo bilingual education has been a first answer to a critical need for educational improvement. Without this first vital step, any other palliative, well-intentioned as it may be and equipped with the finest educational labels and credentials, will only continue to blind educators and parents alike to the need for basic changes in language education policy. Without it, there continues to be an institutionally raised barrier to the education of Navajo children; by refusing to recognize and utilize the children's own language, the schools are guilty of almost criminal negligence, causing intellectual waste and spiritual and personal disaster. Whatever model of bilingual education might be chosen, and whether or not education in Navajo is to continue throughout the school, a minimal step must be to assure that all Navajo children who come to school are taught for at least the first three years by teachers who know and respect their language and culture.

But bilingual education is more than just an answer to a language problem; it is a central element in changing education from an alien function to one shared or controlled by the community. While there is much use of English in

many parts of life on the Navajo Reservation, school is the one institution that has insisted on 100% use of English; all other institutions have recognized and made provision for Navajo speakers. The recognition of the rightful and meaningful place of the Navajo language in the educational system will make school an integral and digestible part of the community, bridging the gap between school and community, and lessening the impression of 'army of occupation'. The institution of school could then be integrated into Navajo life just as the local chapter house and tribal council, themselves originally alien notions, have come to be Navajo. Teachers in Navajo schools, rather than being locked away in school compounds and unable to communicate with the parents of their pupils, will take their place as leaders in the processes of community development.

For Navajo bilingual education clearly means Navajo bilingual teachers. There will no doubt continue to be a place for good non-Navajo teachers, with appropriate sensitivity to their position as outsiders and representatives of a different culture, but the majority of the teachers who will be able to develop a sound bilingual program, with due recognition for the place of each language, will necessarily be Navajos.

The development of Navajo bilingual education then is more than just an educational matter: it is a central element in the people's control of one of their major institutions.

Recognizing this, one can understand why it is as much a political as an educational decision: it involves a major change in political control of the school system, and an economic change in the community itself, as the non-Navajo teachers are replaced by local community members. For this reason, it is easy to see why the major institutions will tend to oppose the development of bilingual education, finding no doubt all sorts of pseudo-scientific support for the need to have single-language education. The special importance in this respect of Fishman's recent work has been to show that single-variety education is by no means as common in space or time as American educators tended to believe.

In earlier papers an account has been given of earlier uses of Navajo within the school setting.(21) From these, the general fact emerged that such use of Navajo language was usually intended as a transition to English, and was always part of an externally imposed aspect of the education system. Various attempts at developing Navajo literacy or at using Navajo in school were closely associated with such policies as the stock reduction campaign or relocation. The failure of Navajo literacy to catch on, of Navajo bilingual education to develop, was inevitable, given the lack of community support and impetus.

Of course a good portion of the present move for bilingual education is similarly the result of outside initiative, from a small number of enlightened educational administrators. These people, some in the BIA and some in public

schools, noticed the huge gap between pupils' needs and existing programs, and taking advantage of various Federal aid such as the support for bilingual education, moved to encourage some bilingual programs. Among the results of these initiatives are a number of important activities: the Navajo bilingual kindergartens and the related Saville Bilingual-Bicultural Curriculum, the San Juan bilingual audio-visual programs, the Sanostee-Toadlena teacher-training program, and the UNM-based Navajo Reading Study. There is a factor common to them all: valuable as they are, they all start as outside attempts to improve education for Navajos. And while in most cases they have led to increased Navajo control, they remain Anglo initiatives, unlikely to have had by themselves much more effect than other equally well-meaning efforts to solve Navajo educational problems.

There is however a second force that is, I believe, much more clearly related to the movement for Navajo independence. It represents not just bilingual education, but even more seriously, Navajo education. The language curriculum in these cases is just one of the effects of Navajo control. The main examples of this second force are the four independent community-controlled schools (Rough Rock Demonstration School, Ramah Navajo High School, Rock Point Community School, and Borrego Pass School) and the Navajo Education Association (Dine BiOlta Association to use its bilingual title). These

institutions and their leaders are fast becoming the driving force for bilingual education and for a new national Navajo education.

Some of the speed and nature of the developing movement for Navajo bilingual education can be seen by comparing the report of the meeting organized by the Navajo Reading Study in Kayenta in 1969 with the report of the Bilingual-Bicultural Materials Conference organized by the Sanostee-Toadlena project in Albuquerque in 1972.[23] The changes are obvious, in numbers of participants (more than three times as many) and number of active groups represented (four at Kayenta, those four and another ten at Albuquerque). The progress is even clearer when one reads the reports, for while at Kayenta one had the first hesitant efforts of a number of teachers trying each for himself or herself to teach in Navajo, by 1972 there was clear professionalism, the results of well-understood experience. Things are still in an early state of development, but the development is under way, with clear lines for the future in evidence. The three years have produced not just higher quantity, but considerably improved quality.

The same is true if one looks at the Supplement to the Analytical Bibliography of Navajo Reading Materials.[24] These 48 items represent not just an answer to the needs expressed at Kayenta for more reading materials, but a steady

improvement in quality and increase in the kinds of material and the levels for which they have been prepared. The two main producers have been the Curriculum Center at Rough Rock, which has moved from its earlier tendency to produce material in translation (usually from Navajo to English, but sometimes from English to Navajo) to the development of increasingly competent materials written and published in Navajo), and the Navajo Reading Study, which has at last geared up to production and has six books out and another eighteen in various stages of production. But there are materials from other groups too. All this has appeared very recently, so that the statements at the Kayenta meeting or in the Saville Curriculum about the critical shortage of reading material can now be modified slightly.

But that there is not time for complacency becomes clear if one considers the potential needs and the present rate of production. While there is now a good bit of material around, there is still not enough in Navajo to fill out a first grade's year of reading, let alone enough to provide for a bilingual curriculum for the first three years or more. It is evident that the training of Navajo teachers will need to be accompanied by the training of textbook writers.

There is reason for a certain amount of optimism, for there has been some serious attempts to meet the critical

need for Navajo bilingual education. Teacher training has started. Under the sponsorship of DBA, there have now been three summer workshops for Navajo teachers and aides. At Rough Rock, with the cooperation and accreditation of the University of New Mexico, a good number of Navajo aides are on their way to becoming qualified teachers. At Sanostee and Toadlena with funds provided by the Bilingual Education Act and supervision provided by the University Without Walls, ten trainees are working in a model bilingual teacher training program. Under the impetus of some of its Navajo students, the University of New Mexico is planning to develop a Navajo bilingual teacher education program. These are first steps towards meeting the challenge quoted at the beginning of this paper. But there is a long way to go. Of great importance was the two-day conference on the training of Navajo bilingual teachers reported on elsewhere in this bulletin. From the discussions and papers presented there, it is clear that a set of plans is emerging that will make it possible to meet the urgent need for at least a tenfold increase in the number of Navajo teachers on the Reservation.

Two recent meetings provided excellent opportunities to assess the strength of the movement for Navajo bilingual education. In January, 1973, Dine BiOlta Association sponsored a Bilingual Education Conference at Window Rock. The conference

was attended by over five hundred people: educators, tribal councillors (the powerful Advisory Committee of the Tribal Council attended several sessions), parents, and students. The meeting, a large proportion of which was conducted in Navajo, made clear the growing popular support for Navajo bilingual education. At the second conference, the National Indian Bilingual Education Conference held in Albuquerque in April 1973, the role of Navajos as national leaders in Indian bilingual education was made clear both by the numbers present and the nature of their contributions.

It would be a mistake to exaggerate: only a small percentage of Navajo children are so far being educated in their own language by teachers who speak it: but the movement is clearly growing at a rapid rate. Given the present impetus, there is a good chance that the Navajo people will be able to use the schools to maintain their identity and their language.

Notes

(1) Portions of this paper were read at the first International Multilingual Conference, San Diego, March 1973. Another section is adapted from a paper prepared for the Dine BiOlta Association Bilingual Education Conference, Window Rock, Arizona, January 1973.

(2) cf. E. Glyn Lewis, Bilingualism and Bilingual Education in the Ancient World, unpublished ms.

(3) E.g. Einar Haugen, The Norwegian Language in America, Philadelphia, 1953.

(4) cf. Joshua A. Fishman, Bilingual and bidialectal education, in Proceedings of the 1971 conference on child language, ed., T. Anderson, in press.

(5) William Mackey, A Typology of bilingual education, Foreign Language Annals, 3 (1970): 596-608.

(6) Fishman, op. cit.

(7) cf. Bernard Spolsky, The language barrier to education, in CILT Reports No. 6, 1971.

(8) Peter Ladifoged, Ruth Glick, and Clive Criper, Language in Uganda, London 1972.

(9) Fishman, op. cit., p. 361.

(10) The data reported here were collected as part of the Navajo Reading Study, and are detailed in Progress Report No. 13.

(11) Joshua A. Fishman and Erika Luders, What has the sociology of language to say to the teacher, in The Functions of Language, ed., C. B. Cazden, V. John, and D. Hymes, New York 1972.

(12) James Kari and Bernard Spolsky, Trends in the study of Athapaskan language maintenance and bilingualism, in Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism, ed., J. Fishman, in press.

(13) For a fuller discussion of the underlying principles touched on here, see Joshua A. Fishman, Language and Nationalism, Newbury House, 1972.

(14) In this section, I follow closely Robert W. Young, Written Navajo: a brief history, Navajo Reading Study Progress Report No. 19, University of New Mexico, 1972.

(15) Sirarpi Ohannessian, editor, Report of the Conference on Navajo Orthography, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

(16) Wayne Holm, Some aspects of Navajo orthography, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1972.

(17) Edward Sapir, Language, New York, 1921.

(18) Fr. Berard Haile. Learning Navaho, Volume 1, St. Michaels, Arizona, 1941.

(19) This research is reported in full in Agnes Holm, Wayne Holm, and Bernard Spolsky, English loan words in the speech of young Navajo children, in Bilingualism in the Southwest, ed., P. Turner, University of Arizona, 1973.

(20) e.g. Oswald Werner, A lexemic typology of Navajo anatomical terms, IJAL (1970) 247-265, Oswald Werner and Allen Manning, A taxonomic view of the traditional Navajo universe, to appear in Handbook of North American Indians.

(21) In an unpublished paper given at the DBA Bilingual Education Conference.

(22) Bernard Spolsky and Wayne Holm, Literacy in the vernacular: the case of Navajo, in Studies in Language and Linguistics, 1970-71, ed., J. Ornstein, El Paso, 1971.

(23) For details, see Navajo Reading Study Progress Reports No. 6 and No. 20.

(24) The first edition of the bibliography was published as Navajo Reading Study Progress Report No. 3; an enlarged and revised edition was published as Progress Report No. 7 and as BIA Curriculum Bulletin No. 10, 1970; the supplement was published as part of Progress Report No. 20 and as BIA Curriculum Bulletin No. 13, 1973.